

**MINUTES
COLUMBUS PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
MAY 12, 2010 AT 4:00 P.M.
MEETING HALL, CITY HALL
123 WASHINGTON STREET
COLUMBUS, INDIANA**

Members Present: Bryan Haza (President), Dick Gaynor, John Hatter, Dave Fisher, Dennis Crider, Steve Ruble, Roger Lang, Tom Wetherald, Ann DeVore, Brian Russell and Tom Finke (Bartholomew County Liaison).

Members Absent: Dave Bonnell.

Staff Present: Jeff Bergman, Laura Thayer, Thom Weintraut, Heather Pope, Rae-Leigh Stark, Sondra Bohn, Emilie Pannell, Nicole McDermid (Intern) and Alan Whitted (Deputy City Attorney).

CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes of the March 10, 2010 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Crider made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Gaynor seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

C/RZ-10-02: Wagner Rentals and Development – a request by Wagner Rentals and Development to rezone a property of approximately 8,900 square feet from CC (Community Commercial) to CD (Downtown Commercial). The property is located at 702 and 706 3rd Street in the City of Columbus. ***Referred to the Plan Commission by the City Council for consideration of rezoning conditions.***

Mr. Bergman presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Bergman stated that this request had been sent to the City Council with a favorable recommendation with no conditions at the March 10, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Bergman stated that at the April 20, 2010 meeting the Columbus City Council adopted an ordinance approving the rezoning (from “CC” (Community Commercial) to “CD” (Downtown Commercial) with conditions). Mr. Bergman stated when this occurs it is sent back to the Plan Commission to approve and accept those conditions from the City Council or if the Plan Commission has a different opinion on the matter they can offer new conditions or indicate they do not accepted the conditions. If the Plan Commission approves the conditions, the rezoning is complete at this meeting. If they disagree, it is sent back to the City Council for future consideration.

Mr. Bergman stated that the two conditions that the City Council attached to the development of the property were as follows: (1) the use of this property shall require the provision of off-street parking consistent with the zoning ordinance requirements for the CC (Community Commercial) zoning district. This includes, but is not limited to the number of spaces, parking space dimensions, and parking lot surface. This location shall also have the option of utilizing either off-site and/or shared parking as specified by the zoning ordinance for CC locations. In no instances shall this provision be interpreted as allowing, through the variance process, a reduction in the total number of spaces required to be provided, and (2) the development of the property will provide a 5 foot build-to line from the Pearl Street right-of-way. Consistent with the provisions for the 0 foot build-to line described by the Zoning ordinance for the CD (Downtown Commercial) zoning district, this build-to line shall be met by either (1) the primary structure itself or (2) any outdoor dining, assembly, or similar urban semi-public space.

Mr. Bergman stated the City Council had some concerns about the context of the 0-foot build-to-line with some of the existing homes on Pearl Street and moved that line back to five feet.

Mr. Bergman also indicated that the Council was concerned about expanding the downtown area where off-street parking is not required.

Mr. Bergman stated that a letter of withdrawal had been received by the Planning Department from the applicant. He stated at this point, it is too late to withdraw the request, given that the City Council has already given an approval with conditions to the rezoning. He stated the recourse for the applicant is not to record the conditions of rezoning within ninety days and then the rezoning is void. This way they would be able to control the rezoning by not recording the conditions.

Mr. Whitted stated the Plan Commission needed to move forward with some kind of action on the City Council's recommendation. He stated withdrawing the request would not be appropriate under the Rules of Procedure.

Ms. DeVore asked what zoning was recommended to the City Council. Mr. Bergman stated it was CD (Community Downtown).

Mr. Fisher stated that the action taken by the City Council with conditions has taken away the CD (Commercial Downtown) zoning and puts it back in the CC (Community Commercial) zoning district.

Mr. Bergman stated there are still a number of differences between the two zonings. He stated there are some uses that are allowed in the CC district, that are not allowed in the CD district, mainly things that are auto related, such as gas stations. Mr. Bergman stated even with the conditions added the CD zoning would still provide different setbacks than the CC zoning. He stated the setback under CC zoning would have been 10 feet minimum and that even with the conditions the CD zoning would allow building at the right-of-way line on Third Street and at five feet from the right-of-way line on Pearl Street. He stated that one of the uses that would change in the CD zoning would be to allow multi-family residential over commercial space.

Mr. Bergman stated that the parking was a significant difference between the two zonings. He stated there were numerous other differences in terms of details between the two districts that

remain.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Bergman what his understanding was for the reason for the City Council's conditions.

Mr. Bergman stated that the setback discussion was related to the context on Pearl Street and some of the setbacks that are provided by some existing houses north of the subject property. He stated it was his opinion that the parking discussion was about policy and in the downtown area, parking can be viewed as infrastructure that the City provides. He stated there was some concern about expanding the geography of the area where individual developments are not providing their own parking.

Ms. DeVore stated the parking discussion was what she heard at the City Council meeting.

Mr. Bergman stated that the condition that was attached would still allow them to use some off site or some shared parking with another use that is in the area. Mr. Bergman stated the most logical place for parking would be on the north side of the property. Ms. DeVore asked if the area for parking was located near the house. Mr. Bergman stated yes. Mr. Bergman stated even though there is a house on that property to the north it is zoned commercial; if it were zoned residential there would have been a buffer required.

Mr. E.R. Gray and Mr. Eric Meeks with E.R. Gray and Associates represented the petitioner.

Mr. Gray stated that the petitioner Kent Wagner was in the audience and if anyone had questions for him he would be glad to answer them.

Mr. Gray stated they had met with the Planning Department staff and looked at how this property could be developed. He stated according to the Comprehensive Plan and the plan for the downtown development, this request does comply with the direction from both of these documents. Mr. Gray stated this request does comply with direction from the Comprehensive Plan and plan for the downtown development. Mr. Gray stated the staff comments were favorable and this Plan Commission voted unanimously for the request. He stated they were feeling positive until it reached the City Council and it did not proceed as smoothly.

Mr. Gray stated that with the conditions added Mr. Wagner would like to withdraw the request. He stated that one of the City Council members felt that it needed to be CC or CD, but with no conditions. Mr. Gray stated that his client is officially requesting that the petition be withdrawn. He stated it appears it cannot be at this stage and in reality they would like to have the CD zoning, but without conditions attached. Mr. Gray stated that this was the direction that the Plan Commission gave to the City Council regarding how that area is to be developed in the future.

Mr. Fisher stated that he concurred with the petitioner. He stated it was his opinion that they have done exactly what a petitioner is suppose to do. He stated they have come and presented their case; and it was forwarded to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Fisher stated it was his opinion that the City Council made a poor judgment. He stated if this area were to be developed as CD zoning and as an expansion of the downtown business district then this would be an appropriate zoning for this parcel. Mr. Fisher stated he did not

know enough about what the City Council was going for. Mr. Fisher stated if you are not going to follow the rules for CD zoning, the regulation and procedures are flawed.

Mr. Fisher stated that we have put the petitioner in a position that he has to go with something he does not want through no fault of his own. He stated we have encouraged his actions, he did what we wanted him to do and the City Council has put it in a position where it all comes back on the petitioner, which is no fault of his.

Mr. Ruble asked Mr. Bergman how the petitioner could opt out of this rezoning. Mr. Bergman stated that if the Plan Commission today were to accept the conditions that the City Council provided, the petitioner would be sent a letter indicating that the rezoning has been approved with the conditions. He stated he would provide them with a document to be recorded in the Recorder's Office that identifies what the conditions were. According to the Zoning Ordinance that must be recorded within ninety days, if they do not then the rezoning that was approved would be void and zoning on the property would revert to the original zoning.

Mr. Fisher stated he understood there was a way out for the petitioner, but what happens if this Plan Commission rejects the conditions and sends it back to City Council. Mr. Bergman stated that City Council would take that up at their next meeting, they could vote to reaffirm the conditions they have place on the rezoning approval initially, and in that case, it is done. He stated the petitioner is in the same position of choosing to record or not record those conditions. Mr. Bergman stated the City Council could consider the comments from the Plan Commission and chose to remove one or more of the conditions or alter them in some way. If the conditions were altered, it would be returned to the Plan Commission.

Mr. Lang asked how long it would be before the petition could be refilled.

Mr. Bergman stated there are waiting periods following denial of requests. He stated if it is denied the waiting period is one year from the date of the denial. If it is approved, but then voided, that is not the same thing as having it denied.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff had recommended approval of this request initially and is comfortable with that recommendation without the conditions.

Motion: Mr. Fisher made a motion to return this request to the City Council as it was originally presented and to reject the conditions that were attached to the rezoning. Mr. Wetherald seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-1 with Mr. Lang being the nay vote.

General Resolution 2010-02 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) – a resolution approving revisions made by the City Council in the adoption of the Columbus, Indiana Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as an element of the City of Columbus Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bergman presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Bergman stated at the April 6, 2010, meeting the Columbus City Council adopted the Columbus Indiana Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan as an element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. In doing so, the Council made 3 specific revisions to the plan document. Indiana law requires that these revisions made by the Council be referred to the Plan Commission for review and approval or disapproval. If the Plan Commission approves of the revisions the Plan is adopted and the process is complete.

Mr. Bergman stated that the 3 revisions made by the Council were all in response to public input provided either at the initial Plan Commission hearing or during the Council public hearing. He stated the City staff's Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan working group supported each of the revisions.

Mr. Haza stated that it was his opinion that the Flatrock Hawcreek connection should not be eliminated from the plan.

Motion: Ms. DeVore made a motion to approve General Resolution 2010-02 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) along with the three revisions made by the City Council that are listed in the resolution. Mr. Russell seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-1 with Mr. Haza being the nay vote.

MP-10-04: Edward E. Cline Minor Subdivision – a request by Catherine Zschunke for approval of a minor subdivision requiring a modification from Section 16.24.060 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance which requires sidewalks or other pedestrian systems in all subdivisions except administrative and agricultural subdivisions. The property is located on the northwest corner of County Road 475 West and County Road 250 South in Harrison Township.

Ms. Stark presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Tim Allen with Independent Land Surveying, Inc. represented the petitioner.

Mr. Allen stated that the petitioner was requesting a modification from the Subdivision Control Ordinance that requires sidewalks to be placed along the frontage of the lots. He also stated that they did not want to show the "no access" on each approach of County Road 250 South and County Road 475 West. Mr. Allen stated they do not want to show "no access" at the northeast and southwest corners of Lot 2 on the plat. He stated it was his opinion that there is already a mechanism in place to enforce separation distances and where the driveway should be located. Mr. Allen stated the Bartholomew County Highway Department would issue a driveway permit and it would address those issues. He stated they would prefer notations on the plat as to where there is no access. Mr. Allen stated it would be necessary to issue a new plat where there was "no access" if the driveways were to move in the future and that this would be an unnecessary burden for the property owner.

Mr. Haza asked if it was because the plat would need to be changed to match the Ordinance. Mr. Allen stated yes.

Mr. Fisher stated he understood some, but not all of the no access areas. Mr. Ruble stated it had to do with site distances issues. He stated there were topography issues, where if a driveway were placed near one of those corners, if someone would pull out with a vehicle traveling at the speed limit, the car would not be able to come to a safe stop when encountering the vehicle exiting a driveway, and to know exactly where that is, an analysis has to be done.

Mr. Lang asked who decides where the driveway would go on this plat. Mr. Ruble stated that the Bartholomew County Highway Department would issue individual driveway permits and he would assume they would go through that same analysis as the City.

Ms. DeVore asked how much difference it would be, between what was being requested in terms of no access and what the County Highway Department. Mr. Ruble stated it should be zero. He stated they would use the same design principles and guidelines that determine where the no access is located.

Mr. Ruble stated that standards may change over time and the plat would not. It would still be on the face of the plat and that would have to be changed administratively. Mr. Bergman stated there is a process to do that. He stated if the property owner was able to obtain a driveway permit from the County Highway Department at one of those no access locations they would need to go back to a land surveyor and have them file a revised plat with the Planning Department. He stated they would consult with the City and County Engineer Offices to see if it was appropriate and then proceed.

Mr. Ruble stated there was a 100-foot driveway separation from two intersections or drives required by the Subdivision Control Ordinance for driveway permits. He stated the access shown on the plat would give staff a way to advise property owners of this requirement.

Mr. Gaynor asked for an explanation how to obtain a driveway permit. Mr. Bergman stated that they would need a driveway permit from the County Highway Department and they would look at the standards for sight and separation distances in the ordinance. Mr. Gaynor stated it was his opinion, if this were done by the County Highway Department the no access would not be necessary on the plat.

Much discussion was held on the notations that should be placed on the plat.

Mr. Ruble stated that the requirement at the corner is not necessarily a safety issue that is going to be reviewed by the County; it is an access issue that goes with the subdivision of the property. He stated for safety reasons you do not want driveways installed at intersections.

Mr. Bergman had asked Mr. Hollander, County Highway Engineer if they looked at the plat before issuing a driveway permit and he stated most of the time. He stated they checked the separation distances in the zoning ordinance regularly as part of their review.

Mr. Lang stated he did not remember these access notations being on the other plats. Mr. Ruble stated that it was his opinion that this should be brought forward for discussion and this has not been done in the past. He stated this is one of the first ones that there has been an issue and was therefore brought to the Commission's attention.

Mr. Finke stated it is a common practice on the County plats to put the notations on the plats where sight distances is an issue. Mr. Ruble stated it was important to get the information to whoever purchased the property for their information when trying to build a residence.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff did not have any issues with the sidewalk modification. He stated he would agree with Mr. Allen that it is a duplication of information to put the no access on the plat, and there is another process provided through the County Highway Department to regulate that. He stated he would recommend not requiring technical comments 2 and 3 from the staff report.

Motion: Ms. DeVore made a motion to approve as presented contingent on allowing for the sidewalk modification and including the technical comments on the staff reports. Mr. Ruble second the motion and there was a tie vote 5-5 with Mr. Haza, Mr. Lang, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Hatter and Mr. Gaynor being the nay votes.

Mr. Ruble stated that this would be important information on the plat for someone that would be interested in buying the lot.

Motion: Mr. DeVore made a motion to approve this request including modification from installing sidewalks and the following technical items being addressed: (1) Show soil boring locations on the new lot, Lot 2, (2) Show 100 feet "no access" on each approach of the County Road 250 South/ County Road 475 West intersection, and (3) Show "no access" on the road frontage at the northeast and southwest corners of Lot 2, so that the "no access" area meets or exceeds the Stopping Sight Distance, as defined by AASHTO, required for south bound and east bound vehicles respectively. Mr. Crider seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 8-2 with Mr. Haza and Mr. Hatter being the nay votes. After the vote was taken, Mr. Fisher asked to change his vote. After consulting with legal counsel, Mr. Fisher changed his vote. The final vote was 7-3, with Mr. Haza, Mr. Hatter and Mr. Fisher being the nay votes.

MP-10-05: Schuette Minor Subdivision 2nd Replat – a request by Douglas Cline for approval of a minor subdivision requiring a modification from Section 16.24.060 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, which requires sidewalks or other pedestrian systems in all subdivisions except administrative and agricultural subdivisions. The property is located on the north side of County Road 225 South, ± 1,380 feet west of County Road 550 West in Harrison Township.

Ms. Stark presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Tim Allen with Independent Land Surveying represented the petitioner.

Mr. Allen stated that the petitioner had concerns about the about the requested no access limiting the placement of his driveway. He stated he was not sure, if he would want to relocate his drive on the east side of the property, but if so, he would have to have a replat done instead of just requesting a driveway permit from the County Highway Department.

Ms. DeVore asked if this was about moving the drive to the west at some point. Mr. Allen stated his client did not want to place the no access on both sides of the currently proposed driveway because he was not sure where the drive would be installed. If this were placed on the plat, it would limit the location and the plat would have to be changed in the future.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend allowing the modification for the sidewalks. He stated that the future property owner could relocate their driveways, which would then shift the required separation distances and for them to obtain a permit for a new driveway location they would have to go through the platting process again. Mr. Bergman stated the Subdivision Control Ordinances stated that they are allowed on access point per lot and if the Plan Commission were to require no access in this case it should be along the entire frontage of this lots, minus where their current driveway is located.

Mr. Finke indicated that the County Plan Commission does not require no access in these situations.

Motion: Mr. Gaynor made a motion to approve this request with sidewalk modification and not requiring the no access. Ms. DeVore seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-1 with Mr. Ruble being the nay vote.

Mr. Hatter left the meeting at this time.

NEW BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

MP-10-03: Jason Newton Minor Subdivision – a request by Jason Newton for approval of a minor subdivision requiring a modification from Section 16.24.060 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance which requires sidewalks or other pedestrian systems in all subdivisions except administrative and agricultural subdivisions. The property is located on the northwest corner of County Road 300 East and Sawin Drive in Columbus Township.

Ms. Stark presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Tim Allen with Independent Land Surveying and Jason Newton owner of the property represented the petitioner.

Mr. Allen stated they agree with the staff report and request the modification from installing sidewalks. He stated that they would like to not include the no access notation on the plat. Mr. Allen stated that his client might want to move his existing driveway to the east and would not be allowed to, due to the fact a no access notation would be placed on the plat based only on the current driveway location.

Mr. Newton stated the existing driveway will be moved and because of that, he would have to go back to the County Highway Department for their approval. He stated if they have no access on the plat they will be limited in what they can do. Mr. Newton stated the intention was to put the driveway on top of the hill on the eastern edge of the new parent tract remainder.

Mr. Haza stated that if sidewalks were to be constructed on the property now it would seem unnecessary, because there is farmland there now. He stated that in 25 years from now, that

probably would not be farmland and the City would be expanding in that direction and sidewalks could be needed. Mr. Crider stated without the road improvements like these on the south side of the road for Villas of Stonecrest it does not make sense to install sidewalks here.. Mr. Gaynor and Mr. Fisher agreed that there would be many improvements on that road and when development occurs this would not be the appropriate time to install sidewalks.

Mr. Haza asked what would be the scenario for the road improvements would occur if it does not happen now. Mr. Bergman stated the distinction between a major subdivision and a minor subdivision; Villa's of Stonecrest on the south side of the road is a major subdivision He stated they were required by the Subdivision Control Ordinance to improve their half of that road frontage, including drainage, install curbs, widen the road, and install sidewalks. He stated this request is a minor subdivision that just requires the sidewalk. Mr. Bergman stated if this was annexed and rezoned, and the site of a major subdivision road improvements, sidewalk and curbs would be required.

Much discussion was held on installing sidewalks and road improvements.

Mr. Ruble stated that in the medium term list of road improvement of projects, Swain Drive to Talley Road, which is 300 East, is on the list. He stated sidewalk, curbs, and gutters would be installed at that time. Mr. Ruble stated that sidewalks would be redone. He stated when you start rebuilding a complete road things do not always match up.

Mr. Lang asked if they have the right-of-way to install sidewalks at this location. Mr. Ruble stated on the parent tract remainder piece that there would be no right of way dedication necessary. Mr. Ruble stated depending on the design of the road the right-of-way may or may not accommodate the roadway improvements. He stated on the parent tract remainder it is unlikely that the existing right-of-way would accommodate roadway improvements.

Mr. Bergman stated that as part of granting the modification the Commission can ask for conditions that bear some reasonable relationship to the modification that is requested, such as dedication at right-of-way on the parent tract remainder instead of installing sidewalks on the new lot.

Mr. Allen stated they would be willing to dedicate right-of-way instead of installing sidewalks and would agree to a no access area at the intersection west of the existing driveway as needed for limited sight distance.

Mr. Ruble stated that access on either side of the existing driveway would be optional to him, but the no access to address the safety concerns of stopping sight distance is important. He stated it was his opinion not to allow a driveway in an area that cannot meet stopping site distances.

Much discussion was held on the no access area, the existing driveway and the placement of a new drive.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one present to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Finke stated if this request would come before the County and there was an existing driveway that was in a location for poor sight distance the requirement would be that the driveway be relocated in an area that would have acceptable site distance.

Motion: Mr. Gaynor made a motion to approve the modification from installing sidewalks along the frontage of Lot 1 on Sawin Drive and County Road 300 East and approval is contingent on the following items being addressed. (1) Right-of-way dedication on the frontage of both Lot 1 and the parent-tract remainder along Sawin Drive and County Road 300 East. (2) The location of the existing driveway on Lot 1 must be moved within 90 days to a safer location. Location is to be approved by the Engineering Department. (3) A 200 foot "no access" designation is required to be placed on the plat along both directions at the intersection of County Road 300 East and Sawin Drive. Ms. DeVore seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

General Resolution 2010-03 (Thoroughfare Plan) – a resolution approving the updated Columbus, Indiana Thoroughfare Plan and sending a favorable recommendation on its adoption as a Comprehensive Plan element to the City Council.

General Resolution 2010-04 (Subdivision Control Ordinance) – a resolution approving revisions to the design standards and other related text of the Columbus, Indiana Subdivision Control Ordinance and sending a favorable recommendation on their adoption to the City Council.

Mr. Ruble presented the background on these two requests.

Mr. Ruble stated that the Thoroughfare Plan is part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. He stated it is adopted by resolution by the City Council and has the same enforcement as the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Ruble stated it is a tool to guide the City in developing and implementing long-term land use and transportation objectives.

Mr. Ruble stated the need for the plan is to address the changes since the last plan update, which occurred early in 2003. He stated since then they have established a Metropolitan Planning Organization. He stated the MPO provides a constant flow of funding for transportation and improvement projects. Mr. Ruble stated the process provides a much more predictable stream of revenue. He stated several projects from the previous plan have been implemented since the last plan.

Mr. Ruble stated it is time to revisit the list of projects and reprioritize them, which is included in this plan.

Mr. Ruble stated it was important to sort the content of the previous plan into the most appropriate documents. He stated the previous plan was much more comprehensive than the Thoroughfare or Transportation Plans that we have had in the past. He stated there would be different sets of documents that come out of this planning process.

Mr. Ruble stated this would allow for more flexible street design than the previous Thoroughfare Plan. He stated the previous one had a standard cross section and then alternative cross sections. Mr. Ruble states that this plan takes a different approach, which allows more flexibility in design.

Mr. Ruble stated there were several people that participated in the development of this plan. He stated there were a consulting team, a Technical Committee, a Policy Committee and community input. He stated there was also input from City Fire and Police Departments, City Utilities, and City Services.

Mr. Ruble stated there would be several documents come out of this process. He stated the Plan Commission members are reviewing two of those documents at this meeting, which are the Thoroughfare Plan and the Subdivision Control Ordinance. He stated revisions are being developed to the Thoroughfare Ordinance and Engineering Office Policies.

Mr. Ruble stated that the review for the Thoroughfare Plan is presented at the Plan Commission meeting and a resolution will be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation. He stated this would be voted on by the members of the Council. He stated this could be approved with one reading.

Mr. Ruble stated that the Subdivision Control Ordinance would be considered under a resolution and then forwarded to City Council with a recommendation. He stated since it is an ordinance it will require two readings there.

Mr. Ruble stated there are some new items in the plan. He stated this is not necessarily a departure from earlier plans; it is more of an evolution of the plan and an update to the plan. Mr. Ruble stated the plan recognizes the classifications of the streets and the development of different kinds of characteristics of streets, such as urban, suburban and rural environment. He stated they would also be considering land use characteristics, such as residential, commercial and industrial. He stated that there could be different infrastructure on your street, depending on what the street is serving as far as land use characteristics.

Mr. Ruble stated the street design takes a modular approach in that you pick the pieces of your cross sections and put them together, this will allow a more flexible street design. .

Ms. DeVore asked if this plan would address some of the sidewalk and access issues that were discussed at this meeting. Mr. Bergman stated there are some changes in the Subdivision Control Ordinance amendment text that do address some of these issues. Mr. Bergman stated the classification of a road as urban, suburban or rural would define whether sidewalks should be installed. Mr. Bergman stated the new regulation with driveways states all subdivision lots shall be planned so that each lot will have at least one driveway location that meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Ruble stated that the revisions that are shown in the Subdivision Control Ordinance are not an effort to be a comprehensive revision of the Ordinance. These changes were intended to match the plan. He stated the complete Subdivision Ordinance was not reviewed.

Mr. Haza opened the meeting to the public.

Ms. Angela Miller expressed concern about a road that was rerouted on the map near the airport. She stated this road runs between the fields at the airport and there is a three way stop at the end of this road that intersects with River Road going north. Ms. Miller stated on the Thoroughfare Plan this road is proposed to be a Major Arterial Industrial, which, is designated as a four lane and would carry a lot of traffic and this is located behind North Park

Forest. Ms. Miller expressed concern about the industrial traffic this would bring in being so close to a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Miller asked what happens to the public input at the community meetings. Mr. Ruble stated that forms were filled out at the public meeting and there was a sketch of the roadway where people could make comments. He stated after the meeting those comments were reviewed and discussed by staff who then met with the Policy Committee. Mr. Ruble stated that they itemized each one of the concerns and went through them and asked how they could address each one. He stated there was discussion about each one of them and that is reflected in what you see in the proposed document. He stated this meeting is another opportunity for the public to express their concerns and comments and have them considered by the Commission members.

Mr. Bergman stated much discussion was held on those comments about the route of this road in particular. There were different alternates proposed after the input and there were extended discussions about them. He stated that Mr. Ruble had visited the Airport Board and asked for comments from them. He stated all forms were taken into consideration and much effort was put into how the input played into the larger picture. He stated this is subject to review by the City Council also.

Ms. Allison Pederson stated she appreciate how this plan has been written and thanked the staff and commission for listening to the input from the public. She also expressed concern about the road that was proposed and how it would directly affect the neighborhood. She also expressed concern regarding the connection of Peregrine Drive to Central Avenue in the future.

Mr. Fisher stated the public input from the meetings was taken very seriously and given much consideration before the document was completed. He stated the areas that Ms. Miller and Ms. Pederson had mentioned were discussed at great length. Mr. Fisher stated that the responsibility of this process is to look at the community as a whole. He stated it was important that we did not lose sight of the big picture when putting this document together.

Mr. Fisher stated he would encourage the public to attend the meetings with input and speak out with their concerns.

Mr. Richard Pederson expressed concern about how the financial impact on the taxpayers by construction of new roads and not using the roads that already exist. He also asked how the priority list is established for the new projects and if the list is ever changed.

Mr. Ruble stated the plan itself does have a priority list of the projects. He stated the Commission has the opportunity to approve or modify the list or move projects. When the plan is adopted with the priorities city staff takes that list and then takes the steps to make it happen. He stated it has to be funded and there is a process for each project.

Mr. Ruble stated the MPO is a vehicle for federal transportation program funding. He stated when the federal government passes a transportation bill; part of the money is allocated for our MPO. He stated different classifications of streets are eligible for the funding. Mr. Ruble stated this funding is 80/20 with the City paying the 20% match.

Mr. Gaynor stated it was his opinion that there would be more commercial development at the

airport in the future and this corner would be a prime spot for that.

Mr. Lang asked how the public could keep up with all the changes that will be taking place in the City with all the different projects. Mr. Ruble stated to get in touch with Kent Anderson, MPO Director. Mr. Ruble stated the MPO Policy Board meetings are open to the public and the plans are on line for review. He stated all of these meetings are advertised in The Republic in the legal section.

Mr. Bergman stated there is a lot of work to be done between showing a line on a map and getting to the point when that road is actually constructed. He stated it is important to be aware of where the lines are on these maps, but in some ways, that line presents a connection from A to B as opposed to the specific routes that the connection is going to take.

Mr. Ed Miler expressed concern about construction of Peregrine Drive through to Central Avenue.

Mr. Miller asked what the plans were for the field at the airport between Central Avenue and the People Trail.

Mr. Gaynor stated that the airport is self-sufficient and is not on the tax rolls at all. He stated the only income they have is from the rental of the properties located there, and grant support for many years. Mr. Gaynor stated it was important that the corner remain readily leasable for commercial property development. Mr. Gaynor stated the airport has the issue of safety to consider when developing new properties at the airport.

Mr. Bergman stated that the pace of development at the airport would influence the prioritization of projects. He stated if there is a point where development at the airport needs that road this document would influence how that development takes shape. Mr. Bergman stated if there were development on that corner, there would be a need to provide access.

Mr. Haza stated this document is a guide and a road map that will guide us in future development and there are many factors that will come into play.

Mr. Haza closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Gaynor expressed concerns about the different widths that would be used when constructing new streets.

Mr. Bergman stated that the biggest changes that become standard at this point are that the local residential street width drops from 30 feet to 29 feet with parking on both sides. He stated the need for parking and the resulting street width would be decided on a case-by-case basis by the Plan Commission as the subdivisions seek approved.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend sending a favorable recommendation on both requests to the City Council.

Motion: Mr. Fisher made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council on General Resolution 2010-03 (Thoroughfare Plan). Mr. Lang seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

Motion: Mr. Gaynor made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council on General Resolution 2010-04 (Subdivision Control Ordinance). Ms. DeVore seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

LIASION REPORT

ADJOURNMENT: 8:00 p.m.

Bryan Haza, President

Steven T. Ruble, Secretary